

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What is the USACE 2012 Future HQ and Division Design Study?

The Chief of Engineers requested the team to develop a future design for the structure of the Headquarters and Division (Regional) organizations. The first part of the study, completed in September 2002, concluded that the Washington and the Regional offices should be considered as one headquarters. Draft structural alternatives to implement the concept were developed during the second phase of the study, completed in February 2003. After a comment period, the team will develop a final design by Spring 2003 with implementation beginning in October 2003.

2. Who participated in the study?

The study was accomplished by a multi-disciplined team headed by a Senior Executive Service member (Steve Stockton) and made up of civilian and military Corps employees from the Headquarters, Division, District and ERDC. (A full list of the study team can be found in the Project Management Plan in Appendix A of the study at *(Link to Appendix A here)*). A consultant also participated on the team. However, it should be noted that the team solicited comments from many outside of the team and the Corps to develop the alternatives and recommendations.

3. Why was the study begun?

Initially the study was begun to decide how to spend the limited oversight funds that are used at the Washington and regional offices. However, it quickly became evident that the study needed to address a much more basic issue: the most efficient design for the Corps headquarters function. This issue was more fully developed in light of the current climate inside and outside of the Corps that has called for changes in the Corps and because of the team's decision to look further than the structural design of the organization. This broader scope allowed the team to study and address the issues of duplication and redundancies as well as developing a more efficient and effective solution to the future needs of the organization.

4. What was the study process?

The team conducted interviews inside and outside of the Corps and solicited comments on a web site. They reviewed the authorities under which the Corps works and studied the ideal futures developed by the functional proponents. They held discussions about the ideal future of the Corps and developed and vetted various structural alternatives to achieve that future, finally settling on a preferred structural alternative. They also identified other nonstructural changes that should be considered. The team developed 13 recommendations, four of which are structural recommendations and nine of which are non-structural. A draft report was then developed to further explain the team's thinking and posted on the study website. It is anticipated that small group discussions and comments will be received from February 19 through March 19. A final report with a

recommended structure will be provided to the Chief of Engineers in May 2003 with implementation beginning in October 2003.

5. What are the major characteristics of the preferred structural alternative?

The recommended structure is based on the concept of one headquarters made up of Washington and Regions, with the regions being “Headquarters Forward.” This will eliminate the need of redundant support functions in Washington and the regions. The recommendation also strives to implement the Corps business process in the headquarters through the use of Washington-based Regional Support Teams and functional support teams.